

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/737,179 | 12/13/2000 | Tahir Sadik Khan | LIFE-016 | 8410 | |
| 75 | 90 08/26/2002 | | | | |
| Bret Field Bozicevic, Field & Francis LLP Suite 200 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | ALEXANDER, LYLE | | |
| 200 Middlefield Menlo Park, CA | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1743 | 5 | |
| | | • | DATE MAILED: 08/26/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | | mx-5 | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|-------------------|---|------|--|--|--|
| • | • | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | | 09/737,179 | | KHAN ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Lyle A Alexander | | 1743 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | · | | | | | | |
| 2a) <u></u> □ | This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ Th | nis action is non-fir | nal. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | | |
| · | ion of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ | Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application | | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| - | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/c ion Papers | or election requirer | nent. | | | | | |
| · · _ | · | | | | | | | |
| • | The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | | od to by the Ever | minor | | | | |
| 10) | | | - | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | | | |
| , | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice 2) Notice | ce of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> | 4) 5) 6) | | r (PTO-413) Paper No(s Patent Application (PTC | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 4,10-12,14-17,21-22 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed structure "card" is vague and indefinite as to what type of structure is intended (e.g. is a rectangular, square or block shape intended?).

The claimed "aspect ratio" of about 0.5 is vague and indefinite as to how the ratio is calculated.

Applicants claim to a hand held meter do not appear to further limit the method of manufacturing ,the reagent stip of claim 14 or the kit.

The claimed "ONE TOUCH METER" is vague and indefinite because the characteristics of this meter could be changed with out notice. Applicants are urged to claim the specific features intended.

Claim 15 is vague and indefinite as to what structures are being claimed by the reference to figures 2 to 8. Applicants are urged to claim the specific structures.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2,4-9,11,13,16,18-21,23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Incorvia et al.

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

٠,

Incorvia et al. teaches method of making, test strips made by the method and a method of detecting the analyte by the made test strip. Figure 7 shows the roll(70) which has been read on the claimed test precursor. Column teaches use for detecting blood glucose in the home or at the doctors office. The use of the detectors in the home have been read on the claimed "hand held optical meter" because it would be unlikely for a patient to have a large piece of equipment in their home. In Figure 1 a hole(19) is taught in the test strip.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Application/Control Number: 09/737,179

Art Unit: 1743

7 0

J

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3,10,12,14-15,17,22,24-27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGeehan et al. or Incorvia et al.

See McGeehan et al. or Incorvia et al. supra.

The art is silent to the claimed test strip precursor as a card and supplying a lance or standardizing reagent in the kit.

Applicants' admitted prior art teaches it is notoriously well known in the art to supply the precursor in the configuration of a card (see Carlberg et al. USP 5,067,309 card(12)). In the absence of clarifying exactly what type of structure is intended by the claimed "card", one having ordinary skill in the art would have expected the choice of the precursor in a strip or as a "card" would have been within the skill of the art as a result effective variable (see <u>In re Boesch 205 USPQ 215</u>. One would have expected the same predictable from the precursor as a strip or card).

With respect to supplying a lance or standard solution, the Office maintains these features in a kit are notoriously well known in the art and obvious as a manufacturing expedient to supply all needed materials in one sellable package.

The remainder of the limitations to the claimed "aspect ratio", the claimed "ONE TOUCH METER", the configuration of "figures 2 to 8", are vague and indefinite and not

readily understood. The Office maintains these limitations would also be result effective variables and obvious here (see <u>In re Boesch</u> 205 USPQ 215).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A Alexander whose telephone number is 703-308-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9319 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Lyle A Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

August 21, 2002